

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

June 25, 2001

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Sysyn, Vaillancourt, O'Neil

Absent: Alderman Shea

Messrs: H. Tawney, M. McCarthy Slagle, H. Ntapalis, K. O'Neil, D. Hodgen

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Training and Employee Development presentation relative to \$45,000
breakdown of use.

Ms. McCarthy Slagle stated this is a brief presentation on our training proposal for this coming year as well as a brief overview of what we have accomplished over the past fiscal year. There is no action necessary. It is just for your information only. Throughout FY01 we started the Total Quality Management initiative. We presented 88 different training sessions throughout the City. Over 1,100 employees attended these presentations in addition to providing internal training sessions and external training sessions we also went to various departments to provide individual departmental sessions on various topics and lastly we established an educational partnership with the University of New Hampshire at Manchester. This is a description of the Quality Council organizational chart. As you can see the Council is the center of the activities and oversees the work of steering teams within the departments which, in turn, oversees the work of work teams working on individual issues within those departments. We also have two committees, the Internal Communication Committee and the External Team Consultants who work in conjunction with the Council. Opportunities that we have presented in FY01 and will continue to present and expand in FY02 include training on TQM, customer service, employee development, policies such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, payroll and benefits issues, and employee orientation. We have done business planning, stress management and other wellness initiatives, and information technology. Our plan is to introduce a program on employee motivation and recognition. We will continue working on

safety in the workplace issues, providing training on communications, additional policies and procedures such as e-mail, drug and alcohol testing and so on and supervisory development and leadership development. Our educational partnership with UNH-Manchester is a supervisory certification program. Thus far we have sent 40 supervisors who have completed eight sessions. Thirty-five more will finish in October 2001 and we hope to start session three in September of 2001. Plans are in the works with UNH for that. Classes included: The Foundations of Supervision, Effective Communication, Business Writing, Financial Skills, Employee Retention and Motivation, Negotiation, Team Leadership Skills, Performance Issues and Effective Problem-Solving. This is some feedback for your information. From the student evaluations we heard that it is very helpful, it will help to keep senior employees motivated and increase productivity. From the employees, in other words folks who work with the supervisors who have attended the sessions we heard that it is making a big difference in their work environment and we have heard excellent feedback from department heads as well who are very pleased with the results. In terms of internal communication initiatives, we are in the process of putting together the fourth issue of City Matters, our employee newsletter, and that will be distributed in the next week or so. It is published bi-monthly. We have a directory of City employees in the works and also a directory of City functions and programs in development. We will continue to provide on a bi-weekly basis payroll inserts on various trainings, benefits information, employee events and more. To give you an overview, of the \$45,000 that we received this year for CIP funding, we will focus \$24,000 towards the UNH partnership, \$11,000 towards the internal communications initiative, we will purchase project management software for about \$1,000 to help track the various initiatives that we have going and the remaining \$9,000 for internal training and development initiatives.

Chairman Lopez stated I am very well aware of the program since Mary Sysyn and I sit on the Council. Does anybody have any questions?

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to receive and file the report.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Presentation by Harry Ntapalis and Kevin O'Neil regarding safety issues.

Mr. Ntapalis stated we plan to be relatively quick tonight with the presentation. To my right is the Safety Coordinator, Kevin O'Neil. What I handed out to you in the packages that were sent out on Friday actually outlines a bit of history and I am going to be brief on that history because it is the worker's compensation from the very start. The inception date when we became self-insured back in 1977. It

gives you a great financial accounting on the number of dollars that were expended for medical expenses relative to worker's compensation as well as lost time, which we refer to as the indemnity column. That first page where you see #1, you really want to look towards the middle and where you see payments for contracted date where it states totals, that will give you an idea of the kinds of expenses that were being made for all categories, the lost time, the medical and the expense. If you look down currently where we are now tracking, this year is going to be fairly low on the amount of worker's compensation and there are a number of reasons that went into that. The lump sum, the managed care, and incentive programs, which Kevin will address briefly. As you notice, towards the middle years on that first page we were spiking and if you look at the total incurred that is the far right column, which is actually the total of all expenses made plus the outstanding reserves that were associated with open claims. Early in the 1990's you will notice \$1.8 million and \$2.4 million. Those were very high worker's compensation years for the City of Manchester, particularly when we had a lot of our insurances farmed out to commercial carriers. We weren't totally self-insured. That was just on the City side. We looked at in the early 1990's when I came on board as the Risk Manager and we wanted to know what measures could be done to help turn these numbers around. Before 1994 when the state had put into law the requirement that you will have a managed care program as a self-insured in the State of New Hampshire, we had started about a year and a half earlier. We started up with an incentive award program and we looked very constructively at lumpsumming permanencies and lost time. If you flip over to Page 2, I know the Aldermen during the budget session had asked to get a feel for, by department, what are we really looking at for losses. Page 2 reflects the year before the current year that we are in so that is July 1, 1999 through 6/30/2000. You will see the total amount of dollars that were spent and it is \$1.2 million on that far right column. \$1,277,959. You will see the number of departments, the types of claims that they have had. You will notice mainly it is the labor intense departments and again that goes with the nature of the work and you will notice the indemnity. Now that is the middle section. You really want to carefully look at that. Where it says indemnity that means lost time and you are looking at \$448,000 right there being paid out to people who are collecting from being out on worker's compensation. The medical column shows about \$750,000 right next to it. Of course the expense column all that means is your legal and surveillance that is done. You compare that to this current year that we are tracking with some of the programs that we have put in place and you are going to notice that the lost time has dropped to \$163,000 as being projected through the end of June. You are looking at medicals also down from \$750,000 to under \$500,000 being projected. With your expenses and outstanding reserves, you are going to be closing out at about \$1.1 million. One last footnote that I should make a point of telling you is that what we have added now isn't only a higher cost for delivering the medical services, you know the technologies that are involved when you are looking at

medical claims have significantly gone up over the last decade. Also, there are no more commercial insured programs. We had a substantial amount of school individuals who were funded through Commercial Union and Liberty Mutual and they decided not to provide worker's compensation for us in the mid-90's so we self-insure them. We self-insure volunteers and again we are looking at individuals that...we cover for the area of worker's compensation at present over 3,000 W-2's that are issued so that is a lot of people that we cover with a little better than \$100 million worth of payroll money and we are tracking it at about \$1 million in expenses per year out of that large payroll.

Alderman O'Neil asked what does the column outstanding reserves mean.

Mr. Ntapalis answered the outstanding reserves are the open claims that we have, what is anticipated and what has been paid for those claims. In other words, you don't settle out everything. You may have an individual who got hurt. They are looking at the potential of maybe some orthopedic work or some additional physical therapy. That amount is reserved to pay towards that claim.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we are tracking a little bit better than last year.

Mr. Ntapalis answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think something that is interesting is in FY00 the high department was Police and if we look at this year it is Fire. There is no exact science to this.

Mr. Ntapalis replied there isn't. If we could in all fairness be able to predict how much any of those departments could spend we really could pinpoint but you don't know. You could have a bad incident in any department. Even a small department could suffer a major loss.

Alderman O'Neil stated we seem to be making great strides with modified duty.

Mr. Ntapalis replied what they call it nowadays, that buzz phrase has changed from light duty to modified and they call it TAD or temporary alternative duties. The credit is really with the departments and the department heads. They really do accommodate their work staff. They follow the Labor Department laws right to the letter in trying to keep the positions vacant and open until an individual convalesces and can come back to work. That helps a great deal.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated Police and Fire seem to have gone down by about half. On the first page from last year I noticed the Highway Department was extremely low and that seems to have doubled this year. You would think that the

Highway Department would have these accidents because of some of the garbage collection people and things like that.

Mr. Ntapalis replied for the most part you are right. It is where there is lifting. Most of the problems we have had have been back injuries associated with repetitive lifting but more so you will see a reflection in Highway this year because we lumpsum the vast majority of individuals. In other words, to drop that column where we are talking indemnity so sharply down that we are not paying out with the payroll every week a large amount of money we effectively settled some of those claims that could have drained us over a number of years going forward and we are only really responsible under state statute for the medical portions of those worker's compensation claims. Highway had the bulk, the lion's share and if I remember correctly there were four or five individuals that fit into that category and that is what spiked it. I will turn the presentation over to Kevin. He handed out something to you folks to talk a little bit about the incentive award that he is involved with that also has helped a great deal.

Mr. O'Neil stated we spent last year about \$16,000 on safety incentive awards. We had about 327 participants. Parks, Traffic and Public Works. Public Works has seven divisions, Parks has three divisions and there was Traffic. We are going to add the Library to participate starting July 1 and our next goal is to have Airport come on board sometime in September or October as far as the incentives go this year.

Chairman Lopez asked you had three departments and you are going to add one or two more.

Mr. O'Neil answered correct.

Chairman Lopez asked why aren't all of the departments involved.

Mr. Ntapalis answered actually when we started...you are looking at a budget of about \$25,000 that we have with the Safety Review Board and that is a first. You folks have just authorized \$25,000 for this upcoming fiscal year. We have been operating at \$20,000 citywide and that is to get the safety committees up and running. In looking at the charts that I showed you, historically in the early 1990's you had some very sharp Highway types of losses. There was a pilot program that initially started up and maybe some of you remember the news media had followed Public Works around. There was a lot of speculation that their injuries were just too far out of proportion so we really concentrated on those labor-intensive departments. The funding that we had available really lent itself to the divisions from Highway, Traffic and Parks and Recreation and it didn't lend itself to expand beyond that point. The additional funding that you gave us this year is

going to enable us to expand that incentive award as Kevin had indicated to two new program participants and that is going to be the Airport and Library. The Library just had their first safety committee start-up this year. The Airport has had one that has been ongoing, kind of internal but Kevin is going to be involved as a liaison to that committee. We are able to expand as the resources allow us to.

Chairman Lopez asked are you telling me that there cannot be a Safety Review Board in all of the departments unless you have money for them.

Mr. Ntapalis answered no. The Safety Review Board oversees all of the departments. As a matter of fact collectively, like City Hall departments don't all have their own safety committees but the large departments do like Highway, Police, Fire and Water. There are quite a few of them and Kevin is their liaison but the incentive award is maybe the thing that is tripping us up. That incentive award we can only afford...

Chairman Lopez interjected I understand that.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it seems to me you have picked probably two of the worst departments to expand this to. I think the Airport should be autonomous and maybe they should be doing it themselves instead of the City getting involved in that. The Library – do we have a run on paper cuts or something?

Mr. Ntapalis replied actually the Library had some interesting claims. Nothing major like the labor intense departments but these are departments that we are able to afford to expand to within the next couple of months simply because their individuals...and schools. Kevin has started up with the School Department as well but we don't have the resources to say expand to Fire, Police and some of the other departments that are experiencing injuries in their divisions.

Mr. O'Neil stated also Alderman Vaillancourt they are only allowed one injury in order to get their award whereas Highway can have eight injuries to get the award. The goals are different.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked as far as the Airport is concerned, are we going to have some kind a chargeback. They make their own revenue. Whatever the City does for them is supposed to be turned back to the City. I don't think we should be funding this at the Airport.

Mr. Ntapalis replied your point is well taken. The Enterprise Department, that consideration hadn't come up simply because when we look at the worker's compensation it is spread right to school...I mean we are responsible for every employee no matter where they work. As far as the chargeback, your point is

valid. How we would incorporate it we may need to look at. We may focus on another department instead in the meantime but that 25% increase in funding that you gave us will enable us to spread the safety communication and keep your lost time down as a department. There is an award and we usually let the departments pick it.

Chairman Lopez asked do we have a plan laid out and a timeframe for putting all departments on this program. Alderman Vaillancourt does bring up a very good point. I am sure Mr. Dillon must have a safety program out there and an awards program. I can't imagine he wouldn't have something like that but is there a master plan as to...Kevin when you were brought into this department as a Safety Coordinator for the City, we want to make sure that department heads are cooperating and the Enterprise system is separate but that is when we can step in and help in that area.

Mr. O'Neil replied I haven't gone to the Airport as far as awards go yet. That is something I would have to look at.

Chairman Lopez stated but I am sure with just the awards program that you presented to us tonight that a letter to Mr. Dillon who is the department head over there, I am sure that he would be cooperative and see if he could implement his program or our program...maybe he has a better program. I think some coordination should be made with Water Works and the Airport.

Mr. O'Neil replied Water Works has their own. We are not involved with theirs.

Mr. Ntapolis stated your points are well taken. We will look at the Enterprise departments closer and save the dollars for the operating side.

Chairman Lopez stated I just want to make sure and I asked that this come before this Committee for the simple reason that safety is a big problem that is costing us a lot of money. Your recommendation is a little broader involvement from management working closely with the Safety Review Board and the department safety committee. What do you mean?

Mr. Ntapolis replied simply what we would like, as you had noticed from the beginning of the 1990's when we were making inroads and we have made some strong inroads, we as a Safety Review Board and both Kevin and I sit on their as ex-officio members. We last met this past Friday and we raised your concern to them. They were happy that the Board is very supportive and in talking to them they had indicated that they had come as far as they can with the resources they have and they think they can get the cost down a bit more. It is not to make the department heads placed in a position where we are going to financially strap them

by...and we heard during the budget process to set aside a certain amount of money in their restricted lines for worker's compensation if they overspend it then they have to answer for it. I think more so what the Board has looked at and I know our office has, is if department heads with the future upcoming budget for next year...if the Board was to concentrate on probably making an allocation for safety initiatives within the department instead of tapping the limited dollars that we have in the Safety Review Board fund and it would only be earmarked for that department to use towards safety. In other words the departments won't be able to transfer that restricted item. I think that would help a great deal because what Kevin and I have been involved with lately is someone needs earphones and it helps when they are in some type of a service type orientation whether it is with the Assessor's Office and right now what they are doing is ending up with kinks in the neck and back problems because they have the phone sideways and they are trying to service the counter. We take the limited funds we have from the incentive program and we help them. Terminals for their computer stations are also things that we have tapped into and were able to make some small investments into the departments that made a big difference on us ending up with worker's compensation claims from those departments. I think in the budget process, Alderman...

Chairman Lopez interjected Howard is that part of an evaluation of a supervisor or a department head in reference to safety. Is it now today?

Mr. Tawney replied it would be very easy to put that item as a priority and have the Mayor emphasize that to the department heads.

Chairman Lopez stated I surely strongly would recommend something like that to the Mayor if this Committee would go along with it because I think it is important that supervisors and department heads and I am sure they do but I think it should be part of their overall evaluation - that safety is a priority for their employees. So your recommendation is to have supervisors and department heads work closely with the Safety Review Board but I would like to make a motion to recommend to the Mayor that he make it part of supervisor's and department head's evaluations.

Clerk Bernier asked what do you mean by evaluation.

Chairman Lopez stated they get a yearly evaluation of their performance and their goals and they present goals to the Mayor and department heads in turn present goals to their employees. I think safety should be a part of that.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I would like to see them leave the Airport alone.

Chairman Lopez replied I have no problem with the Enterprise. I am sure Mr. Dillon could probably help in the process of awards and such.

Alderman O'Neil stated doesn't the Airport come under our worker's compensation whereas Water Works does not.

Mr. Ntapolis replied everybody does, even Water Works. I think the point that Alderman Vaillancourt is making is that we don't put any financial...and the point is valid but as far as our involvement with the Airport and their worker's compensation outcomes I think they would welcome us obviously and I would think that we would have some real dents in our program if we leave the Enterprise departments out.

Chairman Lopez asked Mr. Dillon to step forward.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated the City doesn't pay the worker's compensation. It comes out of Airport funds.

Mr. Ntapolis replied it is chargebacks, correct but we do cover them all.

Mr. Dillon stated the Airport currently has its own safety program. Certainly we would like to take advantage of the expertise though that Harry's office represents and the Airport would certainly reimburse the complete cost of his time as well as any incentives that would be given out.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just think that some other departments that could probably use it where this would be duplicative of effort. Maybe the Tax Collector, the Assessor, any other department that doesn't have it should be a priority rather than one that already does.

Mr. O'Neil asked are you referring to incentive awards or needed headphones and other types of safety equipment.

Alderman Vaillancourt answered anything you are doing, I think, should be done with departments that don't have these resources that the Airport has. In looking at these lines of people who are affected, there are a lot of other departments that have more costs than the Airport. It seems to be very minimal to begin with. Even the departments that I alluded to earlier, the Assessors or the Building Department seems to have more costs associated with it so I think you could pick a small department like that rather than being duplicative.

Mr. Ntapolis stated I think what our intent is and I know that Alderman Lopez brought it up earlier as to what timeline we are looking at. We are hoping that

within the next couple of years with Kevin's involvement that the Safety Review Board and safety committees that are on board that we are going to expand the incentive award program and impact one everyone, including as you said, Alderman, the City Hall departments. We are going to do them collectively. We won't piece meal Building, Assessors or City Clerk because they are such a small group. There may be a City Hall safety committee that we would be working through and an incentive program to deal with multiple remaining departments. We are going to concentrate on that within the next couple of years.

Chairman Lopez moved to recommend to the Mayor that safety be part of the evaluation process when department heads and supervisors submit their goals. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Ordinance Amendment:

"Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 and 33.026 (Police Telecommunications Manager) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

Mr. Tawney stated this change is proposed by the Police Department. The first year they will pay \$21,652 towards the position and it would be classified as a Grade 22. The total cost would be \$48,000 and the reason for this change is that at present we have a Sergeant that performs this function and as a person comes in, takes the position, and learns it, the Sergeants usually get promoted after two to three years or the individuals who take this position qualify themselves and then move on and we have to start all over again. We have to retrain someone to learn the position. It would be much better for the Police Department and provide a lot more stability if the position was civilianized and that is why they want to use the COPS MORE program to put the first police officer or the Sergeant back on the street.

Chief Driscoll stated I am going to yield to Deputy Chief Robinson. The Communications Division comes under his area and then I will follow-up.

Deputy Chief Robinson stated presently our communications unit operates on a 7/24 schedule. Presently we do have a Sergeant who is assigned to the unit. As earlier stated, that Sergeant by the time he gets in there and learns the job in two to three years he is either promoted or moved to a different location. It is not a

normal career path for a sworn person to take. By making this a civilian position we will keep a better continuity and at the same time create a civilian career path. There is no question the position has become very technical over the last several years and we are looking for somewhat of a career track in telecommunications. Presently our telecommunications division handles over 100,000 calls per year. The communications division is made up of 33 full-time positions. We have 5 dispatch supervisors, 20 dispatchers, and 5 police support specialists. In this change we will be moving our information support specialist over to this unit as well. That is the person who handles all of the computers. We will also be moving one booking officer who works Monday through Friday. The added responsibilities that the Communications Manager would be taking beyond the responsibilities that are presently assigned to the Sergeant would be the responsibilities of the two Information Support Specialists. We have over 100 computers in our network within the Police Department. At the end of this week we will begin installing mobile data terminals in our cruisers. This way our officers will be able to handle their calls for service right through the mobile data terminal, as well as doing NCIC checks through the FBI as well as state checks as well as checking our local computers. This is a big step for us and the person would be in charge of that as well as our telephone system, which presently is handled in a different location as well as our access control system. These would be all new that would be added to the communications manager. Another plus for the City is through the COPS program part of this program is for redeployment. We would take the Sergeant that is in there now or that position and we would redeploy it to the street. The Sergeant would be assigned to community policing and work with our community policing officers to better handle the needs and requests of the citizens out there. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated as I understand it this is adding a new position. It is not simply taking one person and moving him to another department? In other words you are going to keep this Sergeant and add this new position.

Deputy Chief Robinson replied that is correct. Under the COPS MORE program we are not allowed to supplement. In order to use the COPS MORE program we have to take that position and redeploy it to community policing.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked but the COPS MORE program is paying for less than half of it and it will only be for one year.

Deputy Chief Robinson answered that is correct. We got the COPS MORE program back in 1998. We have had a very difficult time since then filling the dispatch position. We approached Human Resources approximately several months ago with the idea of taking one of the dispatch positions and creating a

supervisor's position within the communications division, which is what we are presenting to you this evening.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I assume this Sergeant is paid less than \$48,000 a year.

Deputy Chief Robinson replied a Sergeant's position at the present time is a Grade 21 and this would be a Grade 22.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so what is the difference we are talking.

Deputy Chief Robinson answered I think it is 7% between the pay grades.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so we are talking about a new position not only for this year but adding into the future so my question then becomes why did you not consult with the Mayor when he went through his budget or the Aldermen at the time of the budgeting process this year. Why didn't it come it during the budgeting process instead of now?

Chief Driscoll replied it was quite clear that there were going to be no new positions. We did approach Human Resources and talked with the folks there to try to make the case that this was a good use of City funds. Although there are some additional funds there has been no change in our communications division in many, many years. The division has grown. We believe that it is really important to civilianize it and provide them with the leadership and guidance of a civilian plus it will give us a career track for all of the 33 people that work in there where they can move forward within their assignments.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so this extra \$43,000 is not in your budget but I assume you are going to come up with it somewhere in your budget. How would that be possible?

Chief Driscoll answered I think right now we have three positions open. We anticipate a retirement and we would accumulate that money during the course of the year hopefully and come out in the black next June.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the Ordinance Amendment. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez asked the COPS MORE grant is that ongoing or will we never get any more money from it.

Chief Driscoll answered I think that there is continuing COPS MORE grants but they are not for this type of redeployment. I think they are looking more now at providing departments with technology to support the officers that have been hired.

Chairman Lopez stated I think you said that the Sergeant will go to community policing.

Chief Driscoll replied yes.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Vaillancourt being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated this seems to be a back door effort around the Mayor's budget. It is \$42,000 that we didn't plan and that doesn't seem to be the kind of thing that was projected and it is going to be out into the future. If this is a good idea it should have been part of the budget process and not coming in now. I would like to file a minority report.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the upgrade of one Sergeant (Records Unit) position to the level of Lieutenant due to increase in duties.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the request. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked how much is this costing.

Chief Driscoll answered \$6,268.

Chairman Lopez asked and you will be taking that out of your current budget.

Chief Driscoll answered yes.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked why wasn't this discussed at the time of the budgeting process. We just finished the budget less than a month ago and now we have these two requests for things that are beyond the budgeting process.

Chief Driscoll stated I guess I would tell you that it became very clear to us during the course of this year that we were spending extraordinary amounts of money in the court witness program. We took a real hard look at that. I identified Lt. Tony

Fowler, who has since retired, to devote his full-time efforts to getting that under control. There was as much as \$500,000 a year being spent in the three courts in overtime for witness fees. In looking at that we determined that there were as many as 11,800 motor vehicle cases going to court, as many as 4,000 criminal cases going to court and that we really needed to get a handle on the duties and responsibilities. We did that. We have made a significant effort. They have developed a program and I have copies of that. Howard requested that I provide you people with what has changed since the last time this was looked at by Yarger Decker and I have done that. There were three basic things that have changed and I will go through them very quickly. The court cancellation procedure has been updated and changed. It is working very well. We now have at the arraignment process at district court something we call a team concept where one person will actually present the cases and the second person will go and negotiate with the defendants to assure that they actually do want to go to trial or if we can avoid a trial by working out a plea negotiation that is agreeable to both the state and to the defendant. The third thing that has been very effective is we have set-up a mediation day for all of those people who plead not guilty by mail initially, they can then go and meet with the prosecutor and have a one-on-one discussion. The prosecutor listens to them and they listen to the prosecutor and hopefully they can resolve it without actually going to trial and taking up the courts time and more importantly from my perspective to take up the City's overtime dollars. We have been very successful in that. Along with the duties and responsibilities, I think there needs to be the authority to represent the City at district court and I think that is much more suited for a Lieutenant's position than a Sergeant's position. I have actually provided in your packet a list of the duties and responsibilities of this individual and I hope you take a minute to read that.

Alderman Vaillancourt responded my question was why this didn't come up at the time of the budget when the Mayor and the Aldermen were putting their budget together and why we see it less than a month after the budget. Was this something that you had just begun considering since the budget?

Chief Driscoll stated it is a pilot program and as this budget closes out we have found that it has been very successful and we thought it would be important to fully install the program within the City.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Vaillancourt being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Chairman Lopez recommending that a change in the Special Merit Increase Process be changed to reflect approval by the Human Resources Committee and submitting a proposed change to the ordinance.

Chairman Lopez stated there are all kinds of pay with this Decker program – merit increases, cash bonuses, and steps. We now have a committee looking into the Decker program that the Mayor has appointed, which are the original people who started it and some others. However, I have to bring to your attention some problems with the Special Merit Increase. Let me say from the beginning that I was shocked at the upper level management – supervisors and such who have received Special Merit Pay and in some cases bonuses plus a Special Merit pay and cost of living and A-STEPS. I don't blame the employees. I will be the first one to tell you that. They get paid and they put it in their pocket. That is fine. It is the system. I blame the system that allowed this to happen. First employees make managers and it is always the little guy. The guy on the truck or cleaning or mowing that never gets those rewards looking at the Special Merit Pay and the bonuses that we have received. Department heads are hired, in my viewpoint, at a very good salary to run a department. If he or she is getting Special Merit Pay for exceptional performance it must be because of the employees. If anyone is going to get something it should be the rank and file. I don't feel that a department head should be getting Special Merit Pay and as you all know that is rolled over in your pay as well as the A-STEPS. I want to tell this Committee that in doing my research I was not impressed with the system and what has been going on. What is Special Merit Pay? Special Merit Pay shall be based upon exceptional performance of duties far exceeding the normal standards for a particular position. It was never meant to be used as a give away. Example: telling a department head I can get more money if I go someplace else out of the City and the department head says well I don't want to lose you because you are a good employee so I will get you a Special Merit Pay, a bonus and an A-STEP. On June 6, Howard sent to you at my request those that received Special Merit pay and said that these increases were processed in accordance with Section 33.049. However, I do not believe that and the reason that I don't believe that is because in investigating if you look at the Special Merit Pay increases on Page 36 of the handout, in checking this out HR has been going by this particular document. It gave the approval to the HR Director to approve Special Merit Pay. Not in all cases but I believe in some cases the Mayor okayed a few, especially when it came to department heads. In looking at this document and doing research, the other document that you received was from 1998. If you read what the Special Merit Pay shall be based upon “exceptional performance of duties” and “recommendation for such increases shall be submitted by the department head with justification to the HR

Director and Human Resources and Insurance Committee for approval.” In doing research, I found out that somewhere along the line and maybe Alderman O’Neil or Alderman Sysyn could add to this later but somewhere along the line in the final document that was approved on April 6, 1999 it became the action that you received in your agenda packet stating that “actions to approve such recommendations shall be made by the HR Director and the Mayor and/or the Human Resources and Insurance Committee. What disturbed me also in doing this is that I went to the Chief Negotiator and I asked him do you know anything about Special Merit Pay and he knew nothing about Special Merit Pay and after doing more research I received this document from the City Clerk’s Office and I gave it to Howard and the Chief Negotiator to insure that the ordinance was complied with as is. I could not find anything in Decker about this ordinance. The amended ordinance should have come to this Committee for approval. Also, a letter on March 20 talked about merit increase, longevity and COLA and I am sure the Board must have approved COLA along that line when they did the contracts so I can’t find too much on that particular aspect of it. That is why, members of the Committee, my recommendation is that this thing is getting out of hand and I would like the ordinance changed as noted in your package. Until this ordinance is processed, I recommend that we put a temporary freeze on Special Merit Pay. I would note that the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen wanted us to look at the cash bonuses also but I haven’t received that documentation yet so we will only deal with the Special Merit Pay tonight. I would like to have the Chief Negotiator up here to answer any questions.

Mr. Hodgen stated what you have said is what I learned and what you attributed to me is what I said.

Mr. Tawney stated I understand where you are and as we went through the original document going back to when Yarger Decker was first approved we did find the error in the transcription and I agree with you. I have no problems with the way you want to run the approval and we can do whatever you want.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I am a little confused. The current ordinance says that it can either be approved by the Human Resources Director or this Committee so I assume you have done nothing wrong. I assume you predecessor approved all of these correct?

Mr. Tawney replied yes.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so there is nothing wrong with the way it has been done then.

Chairman Lopez stated yes it was wrong because the existing ordinance on them approving 2001 Special Merit Pay was done under the 1967 ordinance, not under the April 6 ordinance.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so the way you want it done, Mr. Chairman, is for them to have to get approval from this Committee and not just the HR Director.

Chairman Lopez answered that is absolutely correct and I don't think the Mayor or just the HR Director should be doing it. I think this Committee has to take a good look at the Special Merit Pay. If we are going to continue it, it has to be done openly and exceptionally instead of somebody saying I am going to get a new job if I don't get more money.

Alderman Vaillancourt replied I agree with you but Section 33.049 doesn't refer to the Mayor at all does it.

Chairman Lopez stated yes it does in the ordinance that you received in your packet.

Alderman Vaillancourt replied I did read over that packet and I believe most of these, if I am not mistaken, were Airport people.

Chairman Lopez stated I can tell you that some department heads knew nothing about the ordinance because I have had them come to me and ask if there was any way they could get their employees any more money over the past year and I said no. After finding this out, I was very disturbed and I think what has happened in the past when one or two individuals or one individual has done this, I think it is an injustice to the employees, the lower tier of the employees, and if a person is going to get special merit pay...there is a difference between a bonus because if he is an exceptional employee he can get a bonus and he gets his step increase and cost of living but if it is Special Merit it should come before this Committee. That is why I am recommending that it not just be the Mayor but final approval would be before this Committee or the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked have you submitted this to the City Solicitor. I don't believe this is the most artfully worded ordinance I have ever read but if it agrees with the spirit of what you are saying and the City Solicitor has no problem with it then I have no problem with the wording either. Has it gone to anybody for the wording?

Mr. Tawney stated it has not gone to the City Solicitor's Office yet.

Alderman O'Neil asked can someone explain to me the difference between Special Merit Pay and the cash bonuses under Decker.

Mr. Tawney stated a cash bonus is a one-time increase of 3%. Special Merit Pay is an increase in the hourly amount or yearly amount if you will for an exempt employee. It is built in to the rate whereas the bonus is not.

Mr. Hodgen stated if I might add the outstanding performance bonus is based upon the performance evaluation of the employees and a specific numeric score has to be obtained before an employee is eligible for the outstanding performance bonus. Another aspect that bothers me as the Chief Negotiator is, and when Alderman Lopez came to me I told him there wasn't any such thing, it would be my position that none of the union contracts provide for Special Merit Pay awards. Frankly as I recall during the negotiations it was my understanding that the outstanding performance bonuses were perhaps based in this ordinance that existed at the time. I think that some additional work should be done with the unions to make it clear in their wage articles that they would be eligible for these Special Merit awards as well and I don't believe that is the case at this point.

Alderman O'Neil asked when do most of the contracts expire.

Mr. Hodgen answered June 30, 2002.

Chairman Lopez stated I would recommend to the Committee that if they approve my recommendation that the process will go forward to the City Solicitor. The most important thing in the ordinance that I am recommending is that no Special Merit Increase shall be granted unless approved by the Human Resources and Insurance Committee.

Alderman Vaillancourt moved to approve the recommended ordinance amendment pending review by the City Solicitor. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Vaillancourt, it was voted to put a temporary freeze on Special Merit Increases until such time as the ordinance is amended.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would actually like to see the whole thing eliminated.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Acting HR Director recommending that the

tuition reimbursement policy be amended.

Mr. Tawney stated as part of our budget presentation in our Wellness Program I had recommended to the Board that we allow the spouses to attend wellness seminars with the employee and as part of that we would allow them to use the tuition assistance money. This is something that we would have to hold discussions with the unions for to get their concurrence on it but it would be at no additional cost to the City.

Chairman Lopez asked on Item 5 of the policy do they get the reimbursement before or do they get a portion before.

Mr. Tawney answered they could get a portion before. All we are doing is allowing the employees and spouses to be eligible to participate in local wellness programs and that is part of the first paragraph of the policy. I have not attempted to change anything else in the policy.

Alderman O'Neil asked why are we going into the tuition reimbursement for this. It makes no sense to me at all. There isn't enough money in the departments for tuition reimbursement. Many times departments run out for college courses and continuing education courses. This just doesn't make any sense to me. We have through our insurance program...the employees can join health clubs and that and there is a provision for that.

Mr. Tawney stated as I looked at it, the employees...it is the employee's decision whether they seek reimbursement or not for the particular program and I wanted it to be available should they desire to do that. That is the only reason I am trying to make it...

Alderman O'Neil interjected the Wellness Program should either be for the employees and not be charging...

Mr. Tawney interjected there are wellness courses that are offered locally by the Elliot Hospital, CMC and different other providers that we don't fund. I don't have the person come in and give a seminar here for the employees but they are provided to the citizens of Manchester and what I am saying is that if an employee and his wife wish to take a Tai Chi course that allows them to calm themselves and lower their blood pressure and so forth and it costs \$70 for one person to go that they would be able to apply for tuition reimbursement from the City's tuition funds and be able to attend those courses. If we are able to do that – lower their particular blood pressure and it may well improve their health then that is the reason I was looking to do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated we are already paying for this. It is part of our Blue Choice Program.

Mr. Tawney replied no.

Alderman O'Neil responded it is. Don't tell me it isn't because I know employees who use it.

Mr. Tawney stated some of the courses...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I am talking for memberships for health clubs.

Mr. Tawney stated memberships for health clubs, that is true.

Alderman O'Neil stated you can get all of these services at the health clubs. Why are we going to take money that is needed for continuing education and college courses...I am going to vote against this. I think it is a mistake. It is already covered in our health program.

Mr. Tawney responded it is not provided by the health program.

Alderman O'Neil stated you can take those courses that you just talked about...many of these health clubs offer those programs. The YMCA and the Executive. There are a lot of ways to approach this without getting into the tuition reimbursement. We paid for it. It is part of our health insurance.

Mr. Tawney replied the reimbursement, the \$200, is if you take an athletic program and as part of the cost of the YMCA's fees then they will fund that. If you are going running or whatever you are doing and utilizing that for 11 out of the 13 weeks then they will do that, yes. There are very few people, however, that belong or have the dedication to do those type of things. For the YMCA, I would say we have less than 12 people who get that reimbursement. What I am trying to do is open it up to more people.

Chairman Lopez stated Alderman O'Neil raises a very good point and I didn't look at it but if you are taking tuition money away for people who are trying to better themselves for somebody that wants to go and get a...

Mr. Tawney interjected I hear what you are saying. I am not trying to take money away from anybody but the tuition reimbursement program is available to any employee who wishes to apply for it.

Chairman Lopez asked so any employee can apply to go to a...

Mr. Tawney interjected right now it is job-related courses.

Chairman Lopez asked so if he is under stress he could go to someplace and...

Mr. Tawney interjected what I am saying is to open up the tuition assistance program to wellness related courses also.

Chairman Lopez asked Mr. Dillon if they have such a program at the Airport.

Mr. Dillon answered no.

Alderman O'Neil stated if they need this they should join a health club and if they go it is reimbursed.

Chairman Lopez stated but I understand that if we offer a tuition program, which we do, to the employees and if the employee wants to take advantage of this as a wellness program he can withdraw money from the tuition program. It is a program that has been approved by the Board.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated there must be cap as to how much you have in this fund for this tuition program.

Mr. Tawney replied yes.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked is it not being used to its totality every year. Is that the point?

Mr. Tawney answered some of the departments use it to the max and others don't. All I am saying is that it is an individual request and I am not proposing to change the limits or anything like that.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so what happens now if they have already used it to the max and there are certain people who...

Mr. Tawney interjected then there are no additional funds.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated what I am saying is that the people who applied who have already been used to the max just don't get it right.

Mr. Tawney replied right.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so what Alderman O'Neil is saying is that people are going to be applying and it is going to be used up for other things so they are not going to ever be eligible either then.

Mr. Tawney replied what I am saying is that not everybody...there are only a few people who...we don't have a broad spectrum of people taking college courses or other types of courses. All I am saying is that we will open it up to these people who may want to take this particular type of course.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated but apparently you have enough using it so that you max out some departments.

Mr. Tawney replied some departments, yes.

Chairman Lopez asked how much is it every year that you get.

Mr. Tawney answered it depends on which department and which bargaining unit you are part of.

Chairman Lopez asked but last year you had X amount of dollars available correct.

Mr. Tawney answered yes.

Chairman Lopez asked and you didn't use it all so the following year you get...

Mr. Tawney interjected some departments did not use the total amount.

Chairman Lopez asked can you use it in other departments for other people.

Mr. Tawney answered no. It is by bargaining unit and/or the non-affiliated employees.

Chairman Lopez asked is it something that a department head has to approve.

Mr. Tawney answered I believe there is a section there for the department head's approval.

Chairman Lopez asked and it has to be job related.

Mr. Tawney answered yes.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Vaillancourt, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Ms. Colleen Driscoll relative to the denial by the Human Resources Department of sick leave payout to Ms. Lori Fowler.

Chairman Lopez stated it is very clear here that the City Solicitor, as much as we want to do something, he has advised us that we are on touchy ground here.

Mr. Hodgen stated as I said in the cover memo to the Committee, I believe that the Solicitor's Office has advised the Committee in the past that this is a grievance under the collective bargaining agreement. I provided you with a copy of the actual grievance that was filed and also with the Police Department's response to the union, which essentially told the union that in as much as the grievant had not signed the grievance than it is the department's position that the grievance cannot be processed and further if that should change and the grievant did want to file a grievance than we were prepared to go forward with it. It is my understanding that the person involved accepts the fact that she is not entitled to that sick leave severance payment under her collective bargaining agreement and that as a side issue so does her husband. It was inadvertently paid to her when she left and the family has reimbursed the City and to the best of my knowledge they do not want to pursue this grievance. I am concerned that it will set a precedent for that union if the Committee or anybody approves it that will spread to other unions. The aggregate cost could get substantial. It is about \$3,000 for this one individual situation. Frankly, if the unions who are not entitled to this under their collective bargaining agreement want it then the next time we go to the bargaining table they should make those wants known.

Mr. Muller stated I really don't have anything to add. Obviously the Committee heard my opinion with regard to this Committee's role in contract disputes a couple of meetings ago. That opinion hasn't changed and would be applicable here.

Alderman O'Neil asked do non-affiliated employees get this benefit.

Mr. Hodgen answered yes they do.

Alderman O'Neil stated we spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars on this Yarger Decker study to try and bring all employees together. We spend I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars negotiating. Yarger Decker costs us a couple of million dollars to implement and the non-affiliated have better benefits than the affiliated?

Mr. Hodgen replied in this regard, yes but in other regards no.

Alderman O'Neil asked how did this thing get in there or not get in there. Why aren't all employees in this City treated the same whether you are affiliated or non-affiliated? Why do we get into this crap all the time? Since we have implemented Yarger Decker we have had more things before this Committee because it got negotiated. It is better not to belong to a union in this City. That is a fact. So, non-affiliated employees get this benefit but the affiliated members don't. Does that make any sense, Mr. Hodgen?

Mr. Hodgen replied it makes crystal clear sense to me.

Alderman O'Neil asked does it make any sense. Should all employees have the same benefits? Either it is yes that all employees get this or no all employees don't get this.

Mr. Hodgen answered I think my answer would be no. This is one of the many things, which is a mandatory subject of bargaining.

Alderman O'Neil stated when we bought into and paid \$200,000+ for Yarger Decker these were the kind of issues that we wanted resolved.

Mr. Hodgen replied we have had these kind of conversations before and I have said before that there are many, many exceptions where the benefits that the unions are different and better in some cases than the benefits that the non-affiliated employees get. In some instances, such as this case, this benefit is better for non-affiliated employees but I hasten to add that several of the unions are eligible for this and do get it and in this particular instance, Mr. Fowler, who was a member of MAAPS, was eligible for it under his contract and Mrs. Fowler, who was a member of the Police Department's support staff, is not eligible for it under her contract and these are creatures of the collective bargaining agreements. If the Board should desire that everybody in the City have all of the same benefits, frankly that will be a significant challenge for me because in many instances I will be going to unions like MAAPS and taking benefits away from them that they do not want to give up. These are negotiable issues that have to be worked out at the bargaining table. All of the unions that do not receive this benefit now have every legal opportunity available to them to propose to get it at the next round of bargaining and if it is the will of the Board that they should have it, I wouldn't stand in the way of that.

Alderman O'Neil stated on the educational side of it we determined what degrees or what classes would constitute an A STEP. It started out with if you had an Associates Degree it was supposed to be worth...that got all messed up. Every

department has a different one. That was not the intent of the Board when we accepted Decker and somehow this got all screwed up. It has ended up costing us all kinds of money and to be honest with you the non-affiliated employees in this City are treated better than the affiliated.

Mr. Hodgen replied in some cases, yes and in some cases, no.

Alderman O'Neil responded in all cases because I haven't seen any non-affiliated employees here saying union so and so has this and we would like to get it.

Mr. Hodgen stated perhaps they would like one more holiday a year as the MAAP's members do get.

Chairman Lopez stated I am going to recognize the young lady who wants to speak. I agree with Alderman O'Neil to a point but this is a tough decision.

Ms. Connie Driscoll stated I don't understand why some of the ordinances apply to us and some don't. There is no consistency at all. All of the personnel ordinances...a couple of them may be in our contract but most of them aren't but almost all of them apply to us especially when it benefits the City. It seems that this one because it is a larger cost item, they are going to pick and choose that this one in particular doesn't apply. That is the only thing that I can see. It just doesn't make any sense to me. All of the other ordinances that aren't in our contract like continuity of service, entrance salary rates and even special merit pay...that is not in our contract but employees have gotten it. The extended work week. In the old ordinance when we had the 10% rule if you were promoted then you couldn't get more than 10%, that always applied to us because it benefited the City and not the employee. Now there is something that benefits the employee and all of the sudden the City is saying that it doesn't apply to us. I also wanted to add that I did try to have the last paragraph about the 15 years of service put in our bargaining agreement a few years ago and David said that he didn't want to raise any red flags and that we would be covered by it because it was a City ordinance.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated this is what negotiations are all about. This is why when you sign the contract you know what you are getting and we know what we are giving. We just can't be handing out special benefits for special people. The next time you negotiate the contract, read the fine print and live with what you sign by. We give away a lot of things that I wish we didn't have to give away but I live by what we give away.

Alderman Vaillancourt moved to receive and file this item.

Chairman Lopez stated we can argue about it and we feel compassionate, believe me. I think all of the employees ought to be treated the same but unfortunately we have the negotiations and union contracts and on the advice of the City Solicitor and Chief Negotiator I would like to move the motion.

Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. Chairman Lopez called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the non-affiliated employees no longer get the benefit.

Chairman Lopez asked the Solicitor to comment on the motion.

Mr. Muller stated with respect to non-affiliated employees, their benefits are generally controlled by ordinance and, therefore, the Board can change the ordinances as a general matter.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it is kind of like an expose facto law. People who were hired have a certain understanding. I suppose if you want to do it for future hires you could consider it, but I don't think we should change it for people who are already on board.

Chairman Lopez stated why don't we look into it. Howard, could you bring the ordinance to us at the next meeting and educate us on this process?

Mr. Tawney replied okay and I will try to pull together the other ordinances on either side of the issue here.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

New hire/termination reports submitted for informational purposes only.

On motion of Alderman Vaillancourt, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file the reports.

TABLED ITEMS

11. Ordinance Amendments:

"Amending 33.076 (Special Leave) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

Providing for amendment to Section D as follows:

"In addition to other leaves authorized by this subchapter, a department head and/or the Human Resources Director with the approval of the Mayor, may authorize an employee to be placed on administrative leave with or without pay in the interest of the City, for a period or periods not to exceed twenty work days in any calendar year."

"Amending Section 33.076 (Special Leave) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

Providing for amendment to Section D as follows:

"The Human Resources Director may recommend to the Mayor for his approval up to twenty (20) days of administrative leave, for employees, for purposes that are beneficial to the City. Such leave is chargeable to the employee's department."

"Amending Section 33.048 (Advancements within Pay Range) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

This item remained on the table.

12. Communication from Alderman Lopez advising of previous actions relative to ordinance amendments submitted by the Mayor, and requesting the Board allow the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance to review the administrative and financial functions of the city with an eye towards improving the organizational structure and efficiency of these operations and associated internal controls with a recommendation to be brought forward to the full Board.

This item remained on the table.

13. Communication from Chief of Police regarding transfer of juvenile court prosecutor's responsibilities from the Police Department to the City Solicitor's Office.

This item remained on the table.

14. Communication from Mr. Eric Isenburg regarding his rate of pay resulting from his voluntary demotion in December 1999.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to remove Item 14 from the table.

Chairman Lopez stated in reference to the communication I have done some research on this. I met with Frank Thomas and I met with the union representative. It is really where an individual gets hired as a garbage truck person and the incentive really is to step down and go into another labor position. In talking to Howard and going back about a year and a half there are 37 people who would fall in that category. After talking with Frank, if we went back farther we would probably have the whole department. It is really a complicated issue and a money issue. Even going back to January 1 of this year would not help the case of Mr. Isenburg. I did talk to the union official today and he was supposed to speak with Mr. Isenburg. I am recommending that he follow the grievance procedures. I will give Mr. Isenburg the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Eric Isenburg stated I work for the Highway Department as a dispatcher. I believe that the precedent was already set when your Board okayed this with another union. This isn't a union matter. I have a copy of both contracts and there is no language in those contracts in regards to voluntary demotion or demotions. I would say that seeing another union was grated it, that would set precedence that the ordinance would hold true.

Chairman Lopez asked did Mike Rockwell speak to you today.

Mr. Isenburg answered yes. He told me that you said you would table this.

Chairman Lopez stated I told him I would take it off the table and recommend that you follow the normal procedures and if you want to pursue it then you can do so through the grievance procedures of the union contract.

Mr. Isenburg replied but it is not a union issue.

Chairman Lopez stated it is a procedure that has been established. For example when you were hired you knew that you were a Laborer II on the garbage truck. There are quite a few guys who are Laborer II's that won't get off the garbage truck.

Mr. Isenburg responded that is correct but the reason I took the promotion was for upward mobility in that department to go to a higher pay scale.

Chairman Lopez stated that is absolutely correct. In coming off the garbage truck that gives you an opportunity for upward mobility. I don't want to bat this thing back and forth. If you want to file a grievance, that is going to have to be the procedure. I have spoken to your union representative and got all of the

background information. If you want to use the case of the Water Works employee that this Committee took action on, feel free to do so.

Mr. Isenburg asked but wouldn't we be saying that we are treating all employees fairly here.

Chairman Lopez answered I agree with you but we have a negotiated contract and we have procedures to follow.

Alderman O'Neil asked we did approve this for two employees at Water Works, correct.

Mr. Hodgen answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked what was the reason for approving those.

Mr. Tawney answered because it was in the ordinance and then we changed it so that all employees were treated the same and when a demotion comes now the person moves down the pay scale. We changed it so that they are all the same.

Alderman O'Neil asked affiliated or non-affiliated.

Mr. Tawney answered correct.

Alderman Vaillancourt voted to receive and file this communication. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil being duly recorded in opposition.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Vaillancourt, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee